



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

must replace the government which we destroy. We cannot leave the civilization of Cuba at the mercy of men like Gomez. We cannot stand responsible before the world for another Hayti, another Soulouque or Baez. If we step into the shoes of Spain, shall we find ourselves charged with the task of suppressing the insurrection against which Spain has battled so long? The insurgents do not want our government or any government established by our bayonets. They desire the power for which they have struggled so long. Are we sure that in a few years after as many of our young men have succumbed to disease and wounds as Spain has buried in Cuba, our methods of warfare will be more humane? Or if this seems improbable shall we establish in Cuba a carpet-bag government, like those upon which we look back with such pride? Remember that when our government was at its best, fresh from the influence of Lincoln and with Sumner and his associates in the Senate, we could not give our Southern fellow-citizens, speaking our language and close at our doors, a reasonably honest government. Can we hope to succeed better with Cuba now? Shall we undertake to govern a people wholly unfitted by race and by education for self-government, when we cannot govern our own great cities?

If all these imaginings are vain, and our success is as rapid and bloodless as the most sanguine can hope, such a victory is more dangerous than defeat. In the intoxication of such a success, we should reach out for fresh territory, and to our present difficulties would be added an agitation for the annexation of new regions which, unfit to govern themselves, would be admitted to govern us. We should be fairly launched upon a policy of military aggression, of territorial expansion, of standing armies and growing navies, which is inconsistent with the continuance of our institutions. God grant that such calamities are not in store for us.

In my judgment there is nothing in the situation which excuses our intervention. Every consideration of patriotism and of humanity is against it. It will increase every evil in Cuba and in our own country of which we complain, while it will remedy none. If we are, as we pretend to be, a civilized and Christian people, let us insist that there be no war.

Why Should We Interfere?

BY GEORGE FOSTER PEABODY.

As a long-time reader of *The Times*, and one greatly interested in its responsibility as a leader of public opinion, I must ask space formally to protest against its present position of endeavoring to justify a war upon Spain by this country. The principal ground urged for the intervention of this country in the affairs of Cuba and Spain is that of humanity. Will not a true conception of humanity lead us to include under its broad banner Europeans and Asiatics as well as Cubans, Spaniards no less, and surely our own citizens? Are not the true relations of the United States of America to humanity ignored by this one-sided plea for an effort to abolish a temporary condition of suffering and misery which is, alas, not too far removed from many others even nearer home? Doubtless the conditions in Cuba are horrible and painful and a sad reproach on the efficiency of the government there, but are not the conditions which enabled lynching parties in Ohio and South Carolina and other States to go un-

punished even more of a reflection upon our self-governing communities? The many crimes and atrocities in Turkey and other lands are strong appeals to our love of humanity, but, as I believe, very properly this Government has so far acted on the sound principle of attending to its own most serious problems and not wasting its energies on more distant ones.

The country is aroused to a supposed responsibility for the righting of wrongs in Cuba. Is it not time that there were held up to the mind and conscience of our people the true mission which for a century and more this Republic has measurably accomplished, and of which it will make sad wreck if it now undertakes to shed the innocent blood of its own citizens to endeavor to right another's hideous wrong? I believe it would be a grievous wrong to its highest mission.

The plain peoples of the world have during the life of this Republic come to look upon her as the true leader in the cause of humanity. Why? Mainly because of her unexampled career of progress, and because of the possibilities for material prosperity and advancement which her avoidance of war complications made so manifest. Millions of the working masses have looked, and should still look, to this country for the accomplishment of the universal hope in humanity's advance. Has not one of the most notable movements of recent years been the widespread activity of labor organizations throughout the world in behalf of arbitration as a substitute for war? They realize that war is always waged finally at the expense of the toiling millions, who not only pay the taxes, but who also give of their sons' and brothers' blood, which they rightly think too sacred to shed. Can a nation's honor be more sacred than that of the individual who once fought duels to maintain it? And we have abandoned the practice. Is it not a monstrous thing to have the struggle for freedom from military despotism espoused by this country with a prompt threat of war, and not one suggestion made of enlisting the moral sentiment of the world by a proposal to have a peaceful adjustment of the issues involved made by submission to disinterested parties?

We boast that a people should be allowed of their own free will to decide by a majority vote as to the form of government they prefer, and yet instead of proposing that a plebiscite be had in Cuba under the supervision of neutral officials to be by agreement designated by various nations it is proposed that the insurgent portion of the population be recognized, without any consideration for the views of the other and probably more numerous as well as more influential residents of the island of Cuba. Surely some voice should be lifted now to protest against such a course as contrary to every sound principle of government.

It is urged that the conduct of the war on the part of Spain is brutal; but all war is brutal, necessarily so, and one of the important elements in all successful war is the forced suffering of non-combatants. What do sieges and blockades mean but the enforced suffering, even to death, of non-combatants as well as the fighting forces? Is it not proposed that the United States shall promptly blockade Cuba in case of war? Will not the suffering caused be in essence the same as that of the reconcentrados? And, again, are not our own people to be considered? Will not our soldiers and sailors suffer and die, and their relations and friends? Is only physical suffering to be considered? Is it not in fact an essential element of the

higher civilization we boast of that the mental, psychic and spiritual suffering of mankind is of even more moment than the physical? Are not, most properly, the affections given first consideration? What hearts will be wrung, yes, have already been, in anticipation even, of mothers and sisters who have experienced some of war's horrors!

A reference to the experience and practice of the Northern army in connection with the guerrilla warfare during the civil war will suggest very close approximation to conditions now existing in Cuba. Ask testimony of those who lived along the path of desolation left on Sherman's march to the sea, which it may be well to remember.

Again, if the United States shall become responsible for driving the present Spanish government out of Cuba on the ground that it has failed to make peace throughout the length and breadth of the island, will we not become morally responsible to the world for the peace and prosperity of Cuba? And may this not involve us in a bitter, straggling war corresponding possibly with our Indian wars, which have been long continued, with the added horrors of the diseases of torrid climates?

Is there not much reason to fear that many of the insurgents are at heart opposed to all law and order and against the protection of property? Shall we not be obliged before the world to protect the property of citizens of Cuba who may doubt, as I am told many do, the capacity and intentions of the insurgent forces? Is this not an appalling possibility? We should not commit ourselves to the bringing forth of a crippled child such as the present Cuban Republic would surely be if recognized in its present feeble stage.

The really humane method for accomplishing Cuban self-government is by a properly authorized plebiscite and a thoroughly debated constitution and form of government, to be deliberately established thereafter. It may in the present condition of affairs be very properly our high privilege to use our ablest diplomatic power and all of our moral force to negotiate such a result, free from bias by reason of the international supervision which ought to be in due time obtained for it. Let Congress delegate to the President the full responsibility and ample time to complete such negotiations, and at once evidence our faith in the power of peaceful methods and moral force by desisting from our preparations for war. — *From the New York Times of April 6.*

The Presidential Policy and the Congressional Policy.

The *Boston Herald* of April 13 contained a most admirable editorial suggested by the President's message on Cuba and the action of Congress in reference thereto. No more just and vigorous arraignment has been made of the policy of Congress which has caused the President's policy to fail, and led the nation straight on to an unnecessary war. We quote as follows:

"If these latter (jingo congressmen and jingo newspapers) could have their way, war would be declared within twenty-four hours, with the result that we should plunge into a fight for the attainment of ends which we can gain equally well without sacrificing a single life. It is a well-known principle in physics that though a sharp strain applied to a bar of iron may break it in two, by the

gradual application of power the same bar can be twisted into the shape of a corkscrew without being fractured. This example illustrates the difference between congressional and presidential policy. The former proposes to plunge recklessly forward, and involve the nation in a war, the consequences of which no one can predict, while the latter wishes to make the influence and power of the United States felt by a steady, irresistible pressure, which, while never snapping the bar of peace, will turn and mould the problem into that form best calculated to serve the highest interests of the American people.

"One after another, the various forms of resistance which Spain has put up have been changed or crushed out of shape. At the alleged wish of the great powers of Europe and the Pope, an unconditional armistice has been declared in Cuba; but this action is the outcome of the President's policy, for if it had not been for American urgency, the Pope and the European governments would never have thought of offering their mediation. In the same way, the offer of complete autonomy to Cuba is a concession made to meet American wishes, and added to this is the official statement that Spain is willing to leave her responsibility for the destruction of the Maine to any disinterested tribunal, and pledges herself in advance to make whatever amends or restitution such a tribunal shall consider to be her duty. All this has been gained without war, and, if necessary, more can be gained by the pursuance of the same policy.

"On the other side, what are we asked to do? To declare war, proclaim the independence of Cuba, and send our war vessels to bombard Havana and destroy the Spanish fleet, each of these having at its masthead a flag bearing the motto, 'Remember the Maine.' In view of the present situation, such a policy can only be defined as pure barbarism, a drop not from the nineteenth century to the twelfth, but from the ways of a civilized community to the manners of the people who make up the tribes inhabiting Central Asia and Central Africa, where war is resorted to for the pure love of fighting. Spain has made concession after concession to us, in a way which must have been intensely humiliating to her government and her people, and, instead of making the least acknowledgment, we propose to stamp upon and kick her for the mere brutal desire of obtaining a more palpable revenge. We are counselled to do this because she is so weak that she cannot hurt us, even if she tries to strike back. For downright, abject baseness, it would be difficult to find a parallel to this proposal in the world's record during the present century. It would certainly bring us down to the level of Spain in the worst atrocities that have ever stained her career on the island of Cuba.

"But are not the Cubans to obtain their independence? Certainly, they should have it if they want it. But no congressional orator, no jingoist newspaper, and not even a member of the Cuban junta, has ever shown by anything approaching conclusive proof that a majority of the Cuban people desire independence. Because, out of its 1,500,000 inhabitants, some 30,000 men have maintained for nearly three years a destructive, but unconquered, insurrection, does not prove that a majority of the people of the island are in sympathy with them or support their political wishes. It is well known that almost all of those who represent the business interests of Cuba are opposed to independence, not because they have any fondness for